

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1430 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/798,450	03/12/2004	Piotr Nowak	46273-127	5261	
McDermott, W	7590 10/20/200 /ill & Emery	EXAM	EXAMINER		
600 13th Stree	t, N.W.	STIGELL, THEODORE J			
Washington, E	OC 20005-3096		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3763		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			10/20/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/798,450	NOWAK, PIOTR	
Examiner	Art Unit	
THEODORE J. STIGELL	3763	

	Examiner	ALC OILL	ĺ			
	THEODORE J. STIGELL	3763				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address						
Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D/ - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.15 (in Children) (in Children) (in Children) - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the size or extended period for reply will by statute. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing aemed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this o D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>17 Ju</u> 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This 3) Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro		∍ merits is			
·						
Disposition of Claims						
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrav 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☒ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/arc: a) accomplicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example.	epted or b) objected to by the I drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	a 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 C				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive I (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National	Stage			
Attachment(s)						
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					

- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other:

Art Unit: 3763

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-20, 24, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Timmermans (4,430,081). Timmermans discloses a subcutaneous port (10) comprising a port corpus (12) comprising an inlet (portion of 12 near 70) defining an opening (70) at one end, and outlet (opposite end of 12) having an outlet opening, and chamber (interior space of 12) therebetween, the inlet comprising a first connecting member (15) and the outlet comprising a second connecting member (16), a septum (20,21,22), a removable septum retainer (17) comprising a third member (threads) removably engaged with the first member so the septum occludes the inlet, and a removable conus (32) extending along the axis, the conus comprising an inlet end (side of corpus inlet) and an outlet connector (52), and a channel therebetween, the conus inlet comprising an fourth connecting member (threads) being removably engaged with the second connecting member, wherein the port corpus inlet is canted inwardly along the axis of the port corpus (walls 71 of port corpus inlet extend at an angle other than vertical or horizontal), wherein the port corpus and removable conus have the same axis, further comprising a fifth connecting member (55) on the exterior surface of the

Art Unit: 3763

removable conus and a hollow casing (51) comprising a sixth connecting member (inside surface of 51) engaged with the fifth connecting member, wherein the septum retainer is flanged, wherein the inlet is canted about 45 degrees, and further comprising a catheter (35) attached to the removable conus outlet connector. The examiner maintains that the assembly of the device of Timmermans meets the assembly steps recited by the applicant.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 21-23 and 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Timmermans (4,430,081). Timmermans discloses most of the steps recited by the applicant but fails to teach to insert the port into a rodent. However, the applicant not disclosed why the step of inserting the port in a rodent provides an advantage over inserting the port into a human. The examiner maintains that this

Art Unit: 3763

limitation is a matter of design choice that fails to patentably distinguish over the prior art of Timmermans. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to insert the port into any animal that the user wanted to treat.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 8/30/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The examiner is interpreting the new limitations to be merely functional. The examiner contends that the profile of the device of Timmermans is slender enough that it is possible to implant the device under the skin of an animal. The issue at hand is not whether the device is disclosed as being configured for implantation, but rather if the device is capable of implantation.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3763

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to THEODORE J. STIGELL whose telephone number is (571)272-8759. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nicholas Lucchesi can be reached on 571-272-4977. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Theodore J Stigell/ Examiner, Art Unit 3763

/Nicholas D Lucchesi/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3763